



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,957	02/11/2002	Takaaki Ono	111932	2382

25944 7590 10/15/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

KRUER, KEVIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-9

Advisory Action	Application No. 10/068,957	Applicant(s) ONO ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin R Kruer	Art Unit 1773	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
 2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
 7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5 and 7.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
 10. ☐ Other: _____

Advisory Action

The period for reply continues to run 3 MONTHS from the date of the final rejection. Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) accompanied by the appropriate fee. The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. A reply within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 or a request for a continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 must be timely filed to avoid abandonment of this application.

For the purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment will be entered. The proposed amendments do not raise any additional issue because applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2. The amendment fails to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant argues that Gause fails to teach the selective deposition of a resist. The examiner agrees with Applicants interpretation of the references, but notes that the rejection never relied upon Gause for such a teaching. Rather, the examiner relied upon Voroba to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to put holes through the printed circuit board taught in Gause in order to provide areas to which components may be soldered. By putting holes through the resists taught in Gause, one is applying resists "except in areas adapted to have the terminals of electronic components soldered on the copper foil." Furthermore, since the drilled hole passes through the laminate, the pattern on the copper clad service and the reverse surface will be identical.

Applicant further argues that Gause does not teach that resists should be applied on both sides of the paper base. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Gause teaches that the paper base should be between epoxy resin impregnated woven glass fabric sheets. The examiner understood the epoxy resin impregnated woven glass fabric sheets to read on the claimed resist. Thus, applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Voroba does not teach what Gause lacks, but fails to specify why the combination of Gause and Voroba fails to meet the limitations of the claimed invention. Thus, the examiner is not able to fully respond to Applicant's arguments.

With respect to Nomura in view of Voroba, Applicant argues that Nomura fails to teach the selective deposition of a resist. The examiner agrees with Applicants interpretation of the references, but notes that the rejection never relied upon Nomura for such a teaching. Rather, the examiner relied upon Voroba to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to put holes through the printed circuit board taught in Nomura in order to provide areas to which components may be soldered. By putting holes through the resists taught in Nomura, one is applying resists "except in areas adapted to have the terminals of electronic components soldered on the copper foil." Furthermore, since the drilled hole passes through the laminate, the pattern on the copper clad service and the reverse surface will be identical.

Applicant further argues that Nomura does not teach resist on both sides of the paper base. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Nomura teaches that the prepreg base should be between a layer of composition comprising a semi-cured thermosetting

Art Unit: 1773

resin and a nitrile rubber. The examiner understood the layer of composition comprising a semi-cured thermosetting resin and a nitrile rubber to read on the claimed resist.

Thus, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin R Kruer whose telephone number is 703-305-0025. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on 703-308-2367. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

K-R-K

krk

Paul Thibodeau
Paul Thibodeau
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700